

To Subpoena A. C. Lewis.

The Commissioner agreed, and added: "I notified Major Lewis. I thought it was proper that he should be notified."

Mr. Waldron—I have asked the Sheriff to subpoena Mr. Lewis to attend tomorrow.

Mr. Waldron said he had also asked the Sheriff to subpoena Mr. Irving Robertson of The Toronto Telegram, and added that Mr. Harding would also attend. He suggested that Mr. E. W. Backus should at once take the stand.

Mr. Hellmuth said he would have been very pleased to follow Mr. Waldron's suggestion and have Mr. Backus called at once. Before calling Mr. Backus, however, he would like to know just what were the specific charges Mr. Lewis made. He would like to have the charges just as Major Lewis made them so that he could answer them completely.

Mr. Waldron agreed with Mr. Hellmuth's suggestion, and the calling of Mr. Backus was deferred until after Major Lewis has been called to the witness stand.

Mr. Waldron called Mr. C. J. Snider, News Editor of The Toronto Evening Telegram.

Mr. Snider said the information on which articles in The Telegram were based was collected by reporters; but he could not say whether it would be found in the office archives.

The men who made the investigations were Mr. Sabitson and Col. G. C. Porter, the latter being the staff correspondent at Winnipeg.

"Spies" Not Employed.

"There is one in whom I am particularly interested—Fisher. Did he happen to be spying in this matter?" Mr. Waldron asked.

"I am quite sure he did not," replied the witness. "We do not employ spies."

Mr. Waldron showed Mr. Snider an editorial which had appeared in The Telegram bearing on the Huston case. He said it was probably written by Mr. C. O. Knowles, and was probably based on information in the news columns.

"I noticed an erroneous statement in your columns about me," said Mr. Waldron. "I was going to correct it, and my wife asked me not to, because I might only make things worse." (Laughter.)

Mr. Snider said he had no personal knowledge of the Huston matter.

Mr. Waldron—You have come to the conclusion that the Attorney-General's Department in the Huston matter was inefficient?

Witness—Yes.

Mr. Waldron—In what respect?

Witness—The fact that there is no indication of the man's murderers being any nearer justice now than the night they fled.

Mr. Waldron—Do you consider that is a sound conclusion to draw against a public department?

Witness—Yes.

Mr. Waldron—You think the Attorney-General's Department ought to hand over the murderer in every case?

Witness—I think that would be splendid.

Open Verdict Returned.

Mr. Waldron referred the witness to the inquest into Capt. Huston's death. The open verdict had been signed by the foreman, Mr. Williams, who was since reported in The Telegram as having expressed the opinion that Capt. Huston was murdered.

Mr. Snider was not able to say whether he had any other information than that which appeared in the shorthand notes of the proceedings at the inquest. He was not familiar with those shorthand notes, and did not know whether his "young men" had made themselves familiar with them.

Mr. Waldron—When your young men bring in information and write severe articles which may be near the verge of libel, or which may be of painful import for those against whom they are directed, do you take any pains to verify your facts—you, the News Editor?

Witness—Yes.

Mr. Waldron—Did you take any steps in this case to verify what Sabitson and Porter were sending in?

Witness—We assigned them to the work of verifying.

Mr. Waldron—And you took their word for it?

Witness—Certainly.

Mr. Waldron—And when you were writing in one of these articles you were pointing to a man (here Mr. Waldron pointed dramatically at Mr. Backus) who had an interest to slay Huston. Do you remember that? (No answer.) Do you remember that?

Witness—I cannot say that I do. Will you quote the article, please?

Mr. Waldron then referred to an article published in the issue of February 17, in which occurred the sentence: "Why were these papers so important to other people that robbery was attempted and murder executed to obtain them?"

The witness said the words quoted were not an assertion, but were merely a question.

Not What Was Meant.

Mr. Waldron read further extracts from Telegram articles, and at one passage again pointed dramatically to Mr. Backus and exclaimed: "That was putting very near the doorstep of Mr. Backus that he had an interest to slay the man."

"That is your assertion, not ours," retorted the witness.

Mr. Waldron—Well, is not that what your articles meant?

Mr. Snider—No.

Mr. Waldron—Is not that the idea that you wished to convey to the public who read in The Telegram these successive articles?

Mr. Snider—No.

Mr. Waldron asked the witness what was the interest of The Telegram to prove that the case was one of murder rather than suicide.

"We have no interest to prove it," said the witness.

Mr. Waldron—If it were suicide Mr. Backus would not be responsible for that?

Witness—Certainly not.

Mr. Waldron—And if it were murder it would be possible to hang something on it?

Witness—All things are possible.

Mr. Waldron next called the attention of Mr. Snider to an article based on an interview with Major Lewis. Witness did not know where Major Lewis got his information, and did not know whether any of The Telegram men supplied him with any. Witness said he believed the suicide theory was wrong.

Did Not See Papers.

Replying further to Mr. Waldron, Mr. Snider said he did not see the papers which The Telegram referred to as being in a vault in Winnipeg.

Mr. Waldron—And yet you make the implications and insinuations which you do there!

The witness admitted that he had never asked for a digest of these papers, or asked to see the documents, and did not know that representatives of the Attorney-General's Department had been to Winnipeg to see them.

"What was your motive in dragging in these papers?" asked Mr. Waldron.

"To see that justice was done to Captain Huston," replied Mr. Snider.

Mr. Waldron—Is that a candid answer?

Witness—Quite.

Mr. Waldron—Was your motive to injure this man Backus?

Witness—No.

Mr. Waldron—Will you swear it?

Witness—Yes.

Mr. Waldron—Was your object to prejudice him?

Witness—No.

Mr. Waldron—Will you swear it?

Witness—I have sworn.

In the course of further examination Mr. Waldron exclaimed: "I should have thought an honorable paper would not have halted a moment until it had dragged out the very documents which warranted the information conveyed here."

Lewis Responsible for His Acts.

In the course of further questioning Mr. Waldron remarked that Major Lewis went to the Legislature and "pointed the finger of accusation at Mr. Backus."

Witness—Major Lewis is responsible for what he says.

Mr. Waldron—But he does point the finger of accusation at Mr. Backus. Why didn't you point it? He might have taken action against you if you had said it?

Witness—Yes.